A

LETTER

CONCERNING

Invocation of Saints,

AND

ADORATION

OF THE

CROSS,

Writ Ten Years ſince, to

JOHN EVELYN of DEPTHFORD Eſq;

By Dr *Barlow* then Provoſt of *Q. Colledge*, and now Lord Biſhop of *LINCOLN.*

PSAL. LXV. 2.

O Thou that heareſt Prayer, unto thee ſhall all fleſh come.

LONDON,

Printed by *John Macock* for *John Martyn* at the ſign of the *Bell* in St *Paul*'s Church-yard, MDCLXXIX.

CROSS

OF THE

ADORATION

AND

INVOCATION

CONCERNING

LETTER

A

My honoured Friend,

WHen I had the happineſs to ſee you at our Act, you were pleaſed to ſhew me a Paſſage of a Sermon of St Cyril's in Binius, and ask me, whether it might not be a good Argument for the Popiſh Invocation of Saints. I told you then (upon a ſleight peruſal of the Paſſage) that I conceived it was no ground of any Argument for Invocation of Saints: I perceive ſince (by your Letter to Mr. Walker) that you deſire me to give a Reaſon why I think ſo; and ſeeing your deſires are, (and ever ſhall be) a Command to me, I do (without any excuſe or Apologie) obey. I know my diſability to give a juſt Reaſon of this particular, (or any thing elſe) but ſeeing you require it, and (out of your charity) think I can, I will think ſo too----Cur me poſſe negem, quod tu poſſe putes? I have hereby ſent you a tedious, and (I fear) an impertinent ſcrible: You know I have a great many little buſineſſes to do, and at this time ſo many, that I had ſcarce time to review, much leſs to tranſcribe, what I have writ. But I dare, (and do) truſt you with all my Infirmities, well knowing that you have as well goodneſs enough to pardon, as judgement to find my faults. If you communicate my Papers to him who urged the Paſſage in Cyril for Invocation of Saints (or any Papiſt elſe) per me licet, you have my free leave, only conceal my name; and if any of them will, or can ſhew me (pertinently and in ſhort) that I have err'd in the particular of Cyril's Sermon, or in the other things I have ſaid againſt their Invocation of Saints, they will do an Act of great Charity to me, for which I will heartily thank God and them. As to the Paſſage in Cyril, it ſeems to me (evident, beyond diſpute) that 'tis only a figurative ſpeech,

an usual Apostrophe, *and no Prayer ; and for their* Doctrine *and* Practice *of* Invocation of Saints, *'tis a Novel and Impious* Error *and* Superstition. *He who thinks otherwise, and can give me any concluding Argument for it : Either,* 1. A lumine Naturæ, *from the Principles of* Natural Reason *common to all Mankind : Or,* 2. A lumine Scripturæ, *from* Divine Revelation *comprehended in the sacred Scriptures : Or,* 3. A Traditione Universali, *from the Belief and Practice of the Primitive Church especially, and so downward : I say, he who can give me a cogent Reason from any one of these Topiques (nor is there any other* medium *in the world will do it) shall have me his Proselyte : Otherwise,* μένωμεν ὥπερ ἐσμεν. *It is now towards twelve a clock, and I more than half asleep (as you may guess by this rude scrible) and therefore (my Respects remember'd) pray pardon*

SIR,

Your Affectionate Friend,

and (for a thousand Civilities)

thankfull Servant,

Q. Col. Oxon. Sept. 28.
MDCLXIX.

Tho. Barlow.

The place in *Cyril* before mention'd, urged by a Popiſh Prieſt for the *Invocation* of *Saints*.

Cyril of *Alexandria* in an Homily before the Council of *Epheſus* on St *John's* day, and in a Church Dedicated to his Name, having cited thoſe words, *Heb.* 1. 6. *When he bringeth in the firſt-begotten into the World, he ſaith, Let all the Angels of God worſhip him*: And having asked who that was, and how he came into the world? He adds--- [a] Μυσταγώγησον εὐαγγελιστά, εἶπε καὶ νῦν, ὦ μακάριε Ἰωάννη, &c. *Myſterium hoc aperi, O Evangeliſta, effare etiam nunc, O beate Johannes, qui voces habes immortales. Ecce tantus hic paſtorum cœtus ad te venit, remove nobis lapidem, ſicut beatus Jacob paſtoribus; reſera nobis puteum vitæ: da, ut nunc quoque de ſalutis fontibus hauriamus*, &c.

[a] *Extat locus apud* Binium Concil. Tom. 2. p. 548, 549. Edit. Pariſ. Anno 1636.

Queſt.

COncerning this Paſſage, the Querie is, Whether it be not a *plain* and *evident Paſſage* to prove (that irrational and moſt Apocryphal piece of Popery) *The Invocation of Saints*?

Anſw.

In anſwer to this Querie, (though utterly unworthy of any ſerious Anſwer) I ſhall crave (your pardon, and) leave to ſay----

1. That I acknowledge this Homily to be St *Cyril's*.
2. That, although there are *faults* both in the *Greek and the Latin* verſion, (which might eaſily have been amended by the *MSS.* or better *Greek* [a] *Copies* extant in print) yet I do not think that the Text (as in other parts of *Binius* I know it is) has been *datâ operâ*, and willingly any way *corrupted*; and ſo I ſhall take it as

[a] Vid. Acta Oecumen. Synodi 3. Epheſi habitæ. Heidelberg. 1591. Græcè p. 216.

it

it is, (granting it to be *Cyril*'s, and not *corrupted*) and let them make the beſt of it.

3. That I wonder any knowing perſon ſhould ſeriouſly cite a paſſage ſo *inſignificant*, and altogether impertinent: which carries no ſhadow of proof of that, for which it is produced. Sure I am, *Binius* (who diligently obſerves and urgeth whatever may advantage the *Catholick Cauſe*, (as they commonly miſcall it) takes no *notice of this paſſage* of *Cyril*, (as appears by his [b] Notes, in which he hath nothing of it) which he would not have *omitted*, had he conceived it a *pertinent proof* of the *Romiſh Invocation* of Saints. Nor does [c] *Bellarmine*, *Hen.* [d] *Vicus*, *Gabriel* [e] *Vaſquez*, *Gregorius* [f] *de Valentia*, or any I have yet met with, (though poſſibly others may) make uſe of this paſſage of *Cyril* to prove *Invocation of Saints*, when and where they do *ex profeſſo*, and *datâ operâ*, diligently quote all the *Councils* and *Fathers* they can to prove that point.

[b] In calce Part. 3. Concil. Epheſini, Tom. 2. p. 665, *&c.*

[c] Bellarm. de Sanctor. Beatitud. lib. 1. cap. 19.
[d] Hen. Vicus Tit. 24. de Sanct. Invocatione, pag. 342, 343.
[e] Vaſquez lib. 1. De Adoratione Diſput. 5. cap. 2.
[f] Valentia, Diſput. 6. Quæſt. 2. De Oratione Puncto 7. Tom. 3. pag. 1261.

4. It is well known to all (to whom *Rhetorique* and *Theologie* are not *unknown*) that there is a vaſt difference between a *figurative*, and a *proper phraſe* and *form of ſpeech*, between a *Rhetorical Apoſtrophe*, and a *Theologicall Prayer*. And that ſuch Rhetorical and *figurative expreſſions* are very uſual in *all Authors*, Sacred or Civil, (eſpecially in *Poets* and *Orators*) is certain, and on all ſides confeſs'd. For inſtance, 1. An Apoſtrophe, they ſay, is [g] *Figura cùm à Judice vel Auditore ad abſentem aliquem Orationem convertimus, & quaſi præſentem alloquimur.* So *Virgil*,--- [h] *Muſa mihi cauſas memora*, &c. So *Tully*,--- [i] *Te nunc alloquor*

[g] Vid. Euſtath. ad Ὁ. Πρωτ. Ἰλιάδ. Homeri, pag. 453. l. 11. Romæ 1542. Quintil. Inſtitut. Orat. lib. 9. cap. 2.
[h] Virgil. Æneid. 1.
[i] Cicero Orat. pro Cluentio.

quor Africane, cujus mortui nomen ſplendori & decori eſt Civitati. And *David*, (or whoever was Author of that [k] Pſalm) has an Apoſtrophe *to Kings and People, Princes and all Judges, Men and Maids, Young and Old*, calling upon them to praiſe the Lord. That the words of *David* (or thoſe of *Virgil* or *Tully*) were *properly a Prayer*, or any more than *an Apoſtrophe*, a *figurative and Rhetorical Invocation*, as none (with any Truth or Reaſon) can, ſo, I ſuppoſe, none will ſay; or if any do, they may as well ſay, That *he pray'd* to the *Sun and Moon, to Stars, Beaſts, Birds and Fiſhes*; (for the *Apoſtrophe* or *Proſopopœia* is equally [l] addreſs'd to them) which were very irrational in the judgement of a Learned [m] Papiſt, who truly tells us, that 'tis a *Proſopopœia* and not a *Prayer*. In the Song of the three Children (which is Canonical to them of *Rome*) all Creatures *in Heaven and Earth are* [n] *call'd upon to bleſs the Lord*; and then v. 86. it follows--*Benedicite ſpiritus & animæ juſtorum Domino*, &c. The words evidently contain a *Rhetorical figure*, an Apoſtrophe, not *a prayer*, as will, (and muſt) be confeſs'd by the Popiſh Party; who ſay, that in *the time of the Old Teſtament*, there was *no Invocation of Saints*, becauſe *their ſouls* (before our bleſſed Saviours *reſurrection*) did not enjoy the *beatifical Viſion*, and ſo could *not underſtand the wants or prayers of men* living here below.

[k] Pſal. 148. 11, 12, 13, &c.

[l] Ibid. verſ. 3, 4, 5, 6, &c.

[m] Sim. de Muis, in Pſal. 148. verſ. 3.

[n] Dan. 3. 52, 53, &c. Edit. lat. vulgatæ. *So* Iſai. 1. 2. *Hear O heavens, and hark O earth.* So *Cicero* calls to the Hills and Woods of *Alba*—*Vos Albani tumuli atque luci, oro & obteſtor*, &c. No Prayer, but a Rhetorical Proſopopœia.

Once more, we have the like Rhetorical Apoſtrophe in [o] *Nazianzene*. Ἀκούσατε πᾶσαι, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, &c. *Audite hæc omnes gentes, omnes qui habitatis terram auribus percipite----Audi Cœlum & auribus percipe Terra----Audi hæc etiam*

[o] Nazianz. in Invectivâ 1. contra Julianum, in principio.

Conſtantii

Conſtantii magni anima (εἴ τις αἴσθησις) *ſi quis mortuis ſenſus eſt*, &c. Here we have a *Rhetorical figure*, but no *Prayer* (as is manifeſt) and 'tis obſervable, that *Nazianzene* could not tell, whether the Soul of *Conſtantius* (whom he ſo much commends in that Oration) could hear him: and therefore he adds, εἴ τις αἴσθησις, or (as the Greek Scholiaſt expounds it) ἐάν τις αἴσθησις ὄζει πρὸς τῶνδε ἀκούειν, *Si quis ſenſus ſit quo res hîc geſtas audiat.* And in *Cyril's Works* (beſides this [p] Oration of his in *Binius*, of which we are now ſpeaking) there is [q] another, wherein he has the like *Apoſtrophe* to St *John* and others, thus---- χαίροις δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς τελσμακάρειε Ἰωάννη Ἀπόστολε καὶ εὐαγγελιστὰ, τῆς παρθενίας καύχημα, &c. *Salve porro, ô ter beate Johannes Apoſtole & Evangeliſta, virginitatis decus, pudicitiæ magiſter, diabolicæ fraudis exterminator, Epheſinæ urbis portus & propugnaculum, pauperum nutritor, afflictorum, peregrinorum quies & refrigerium*----And then it follows,---- *Salve Maria Deipara, Virgo Mater, Lucifera, vas incorruptum*, &c. all which (and much more which follows) is only an uſual *Apoſtrophe*, a *Rhetorical figure*, and properly *no Religious Invocation or Prayer*: Unleſs we will ſay, that he prays *to the City of Epheſus*, for in the ſame [r] place he invokes that in the ſame form---- χαίροις ὦ Ἐφεσίων πόλις, μᾶλλον δὲ θαλασσοθέα, &c. *Salve Epheſiorum Urbs, vel potius maris Dea, vel ſpectaculum*, (for ſo it ſhould be rendered.) This (as the other before) is clearly an *Apoſtrophe*, a *Rhetorical figure*, but *nothing of a Prayer*. In relation to ſuch paſſages in Eccleſiaſtical Writers (eſpecially the *Greek Fathers* in their *Orations* and *Poems*) it is a good caution which is given by a *Learned Papiſt*----*Sæpe monuimus* (ſaith

[p] This Oration of *Cyril's* in *Binius*, occurs in *Cyril's* Works, Tom. 5. Part. 2. pag. 352.
[q] Ibid. pag. 379.

[r] Cyril. ibidem in Encomio in ſanctam Mariam Deiparam, pag. 379. I.

(saith [f] he) *non esse Concionatorum verba semper eo rigore accipienda, quo primùm ad aures auditorum perveniunt. Multa enim Declamatores per hyperbolen crebrò enuntiant, vel occasione locorum, temporum, ac personarum adducti, vel affectuum impetu & Orationis cursu rapti*, &c. So evident it is, and on all sides confess'd, that 'tis neither rational nor safe to make *Rhetorical expressions Principles*, and Foundations, *and Grounds of Theological Reasons*; to *make figures premisses*, and *thence inferre* (what will not follow) *conclusions in Divinity*. Now to bring this home to our present Passage in *Cyril*'s Homilie: I say,

[f] Sixtus Senensis Bibliothecæ Sanctæ lib. 6. Annotat. 152. Vide Theodoret. Dialogo 3. Where he sayes, *That no Rule of Doctrine is to be taken from the Panegyrical Orations of the Fathers.*

5. That the Passage in *Cyril* (like those above-mention'd) is only a *Rhetorical Apostrophe* to St *John*; a *figurative Speech, but no Prayer*. This will be evident to any who impartially considers *Cyril*'s *Words*. 1. He cites that place, *Heb.* 1. 6. *Cùm inducit primogenitum in orbem terrarum, dicit; Et adorent eum omnes Angeli Dei.* 2. He asks, *Quis is est qui in orbem terrarum ingressus est?* And intending (as appears by the sequel) to answer that Question with a Passage in St *John*'s Gospel; He does, 3. Make a long *Rhetorical Apostrophe* to St *John*, as if he were *there present*, Μυςαγώγησον, εὐαγγελιςὰ, εἰπὲ καὶ νῦν, &c. *Mysterium hoc aperi, O Evangelista; effare etiam NUNC, O beate Johannes, qui voces habes immortales; & oblivio ac tempus tuis cedunt verbis. Ecce tantus hic Pastorum cœtus ad te venit; remove lapidem, resera nobis puteum vitæ: Da ut NUNC quoque de salutis fontibus hauriamus: Imò verò tuum nobis fontem appone.* οὐκοῦν ἀκούωμεν λέγοντος, *Annon DICENTEM AUDIMUS?* (for so it should

be read, and render'd) or, as it is in *Binius* (for 'tis all one, as to our preſent buſineſs) ὑκούω ἀκούσωμεν λέγοντος, *AUDIAMUS itaq; DICENTEM.* All this is ſpoken by way of *Apoſtrophe* to St *John, as if he had been preſent, and heard them*: And then, (*as if* John *had given his Anſwer, and they heard him*) it follows, *Audiamus itaque dicentem.* Well, Firſt, *Where* did *John* ſpeak this which they were to hear? *Non in Cœlo,* (for they had need of *long ears*, and he a *loud voice*, if at that diſtance they could hear him) *ſed in Evangelio.* Secondly, *When* did *John* ſpeak this? *Not when* Cyril [t] *made this Sermon*, and ſaid, *Audiamus itaq; dicentem*: but about *three hundred and thirty years before*, when he [u] writ his Goſpel. Thirdly, *What was* it he ſpake? Not any thing *de novo*; but what he *had ſpoke and writ* ſo long before in the 1 *Chap.* and 1. *verſe* of his Goſpel; for *Cyril* having ſaid---- *Audiamus itaque Johannem dicentem*, he immediately adds, (what *John* ſaid, and he would have them to hear) *In principio erat verbum, & verbum erat apud Deum, & Deus erat verbum.* Whence I further obſerve,

[t] *The Sermon was made when the Council of* Epheſus *ſate, which was* Anno 431.

[u] Scripſit Evangelium paulò ante mortem: moritur Anno Chriſti 101. Euſeb. in Chronico, & Hieronymus de ſcript. Illuſtr. in Johanne.

6. That this *paſſage* of *Cyril*, which is pretended to be a *Prayer*, and a *proof of their Invocation of Saints*, is only a piece of *Cyril*'s *Homilie* or *Sermon*, not of any *Prayer* either before or after it.

7. All *Cyril* deſires of *John* in this Paſſage (and pretended Prayer) is only this; *That he would tell them* what they *well knew already*, out of that Goſpel he had writ above *three hundred* years before. For ſo the words are----- *Da, ut nunc de ſalutis fontibus hauriamus; imò*

TUUM

TUUM nobis FONTEM appone. By *fontes ſalutis*, he means the *Goſpels*; and by *TUUM FONTEM*, St *John's Goſpel*; and ſo all he deſires is, That St *John would ſet his Goſpel before them* (which was before them already) that out of it they might draw, or *learn that paſſage*---- *In principio erat verbum*, &c. Now for *Cyril* (or any body elſe) to deſire of *John* in a *ſerious Prayer*, that he would tell them, what he *had told them* (and they *well knew*) *long before, were irrational and ridiculous*: But to do it (as beyond diſpute, *Cyril* here does) by way of an uſual *figure* and *Rhetorical Apoſtrophe*, is not only allowable, but in the beſt Authors *commendable*. *Cyril* ſayes here---- *Audiamus Johannem dicentem, Let us hear what Saint John ſaith*, (though in truth, and propriety of ſpeech, St *John* ſpoke *not one word then*, nor was it poſſible they ſhould hear him ſpeak what *he ſpoke not.*) And ſo *our Church in her* * *Liturgy* makes uſe of the very ſame *figurative expreſſion*,---- *Hear what comfortable words our Saviour ſaith*---- And again, *Hear what Saint Paul ſaith*---- And again---*Hear what Saint John ſaith.* The truth manifeſtly is this: The Prieſt, who Officiates at our Communion, exhorts the Congregation to hear what our bleſſed *Saviour*, what *Paul*, and *John* ſaith (in the preſent tenſe) when he reads unto them comfortable Paſſages ſpoke by then *ſixteen hundred* years before, and left upon Record in the Goſpel out of which he reads them. So St *Cyril* here in his Sermon, being to prove the *Dignity* and *Divinity* of our bleſſed *Saviours perſon, out of Saint* John's *Goſpel*; he firſt makes that long *Rhetorical harangue* and *Apoſtrophe* to *John* (as if

* *In the Communion Service, a little after the General Confeſſion.* 1.

be were preſent and heard it) and then cites the *Text*, as if he had *ſpoke it then*, which he well knew *was not then ſpoken by John*, but about *three hundred and thirty* years before. So that, he who makes *Cyril*'s words here, to be any thing but a *Figurative Expreſſion*, and a *Rhetorical Apoſtrophe*; he who would have his words (*in propriety of Speech*) a *ſerious Prayer*, and ſupplication to *John*, that he would tell them, what he had already (*three hundred* years before) *told*, and they *certainly knew*: I ſay, he who makes this the meaning of *Cyril*'s words, makes both *Cyril and himſelf ridiculous*.

Dub. Well, but *ſuppoſe* (though it be *evidently untrue*) that *Cyril* did, *in this Sermon* and Paſſage, *properly* (without any figure) and *truly pray to Saint John*; will it not be a *great Argument for the Popiſh Invocation of Saints*, and confirm the *truth of their Doctrine*? &c.

Reſp. No, it will be *no Argument at all*. For, it being granted, that *Cyril did pray to Saint John*; it will not follow, that *Invocation of Saints* is commendable, or (*to him, or us*) *lawfull*. All the Argument that can be built upon this Paſſage (taken in their own ſenſe, which yet is evidently falſe) is only this---*Cyril prayed to John a dead Saint*, [ergo] *Invocation of Saints is lawfull*, which is an *illogical deduction*, evidently inconſequent, no better than theſe---*David committed Adultery* [ergo] *Adultery is lawfull*. *Peter deny'd, and forſwore his Saviour*, [ergo] *we may do ſo*. All men know, that *A facto ad jus, non valet argumentum*. *Sempronius* or *Titius* did ſuch a work, [*ergo*] *It was well done*, or, *we may do it*, this is *irrational*, and a manifeſt *non ſequitur*. *Cyril*'s *Fact* (if he had done it) does

does no more juſtifie *Invocation of Saints*, than what *David and Peter did*, the *lawfulneſs of Adultery, and denying our Lord and Maſter.* If it be ſaid, *Cyril was a Saint, a great and good man*, and therefore his Example of more weight and *more imitable.* I anſwer, 1. He is *call'd a Saint*, and I (in charity) believe him ſo; but whether he *really be a Saint*, none under Heaven does, or can *certainly know*, no not the Pope, notwithſtanding his *Infallibility.* 2. He was (I grant) a great and (for ought I know) a good man; but *David* and *Peter* (for many reaſons I do know) were far greater and better, as far before him in *dignity and piety, as in time*; and therefore his *Action* (had it been his) will no more *warrant Invocation of Saints*, than *Davids* or *Peters* can legitimate *Adultery* or *Perjury.*

But this was not *Cyril's Fact or Opinion* only, but the *Judgement of the Oecumenical Council of Epheſus*: It was *in that Council* he had that *Homilie.* It was *Cyril and the Council pray'd to Saint John*---- ἰδὺ, τοσαύτη ποιμένων ἀθροισις, &c. *Ecce tantus* PASTORUM COETUS *ad te venit*, it was the *whole Synod* which did ſupplicate to St *John*; and therefore *Invocation of Saints* has not only *the Approbation* and *Authority* of *Cyril*, but of the *whole Oecumenical Synod of Epheſus.* This is the *utmoſt can be ſaid* (by thoſe who bring it) in the proſecution *and preſſing* this Argument. *Dub.*

To this, (which is all *gratis dictum*) I ſay, 1. That 'tis evident (and, I believe, may in part appear by what is aboveſaid) this *whole paſſage* in *Cyril*, is only a *figurative ſpeech*, an *Apoſtrophe*, but no Prayer to *Saint John*; and ſo (though it have the *approbation of Cyril, and the Synod too*) is altogether *impertinent*, and no *proof of Invocation of Saints.* 2. I deny *this Sermon*, or *this paſſage in it*, to *Reſp.*

have

have the Authority and approbation of the Council in which it was ſpoke. 'Tis true, the Sermon was ſpoke *in the Synod at Epheſus*, and is regiſter'd amongſt the *Acts of that Council*: But all know, who have read and conſidered the *Acts and Editions of Councils*, that many things have been *read and ſpoken publickly* in them, and are now Recorded amongſt the *Acts of ſuch Synods*, which are but of *private* (not Synodical) Authority; ſuch are *Sermons*, *Letters*, *Petitions*, *Diſputations*, and ſuch like, which *have been ſpoke or read*, or heard publickly in *Councils*, and yet have *no Authority* beyond that of their *particular Authors*, and the perſons whoſe they were, and whence they came. This is moſt undeniably certain, in the *Canons*, and *Synodical Definitions* of all Councils; Whatever, in *any Council*, has the *Aſſent* and *Subſcriptions* of the Fathers in it; this, and *only this*, as it has the *Approbation* and *Definition*, ſo it has the *Authority* and *Ratification* of the *Council*: But ſuch Authority (ariſing from *the Approbation or ſubſcription* of the Synod) *this Sermon never had*. 3. I confeſs, theſe words---- [*Ecce tantus Paſtorum Cœtus venit ad te*] are in that *Sermon*; but they are the words of *Cyril*, not of the *Synod*; and ſo all the Authority they have, (or can have) is *perſonal*, (depending on *one ſingle perſon*) and not *Synodical*. 4. That many things (*Sermons*, *Epiſtles*, *Petitions*, &c.) are Recorded amongſt the Acts of Synods, which have no *Synodical Authority*, is, and muſt be confeſſed on all ſides, ſeeing a hundred ſuch things occur in the Tomes of the Councils, which neither *Proteſtant nor Papiſt believe*: As may appear in an Inſtance or two, Thus

1. In the ſecond *Nicene Council*, which (though it really

was

was an Erroneous and *Impious Conventicle*, yet) at *Rome* is received as a Legitimate *General Council*: *John* Bishop of *Thessalonica* declares publickly—That the *Rational Soul*, Angels, Archangels, and all Spirits are *Corporeal* and *Visible*—γ ὁ μὲν ἀνωμάτως αὐτὰ καὶ ἀσώματος—*Non sunt incorporales omnino & invisibiles, sicut Pagani fatentur*—ἀσώματος. ὁ δὲ ὡσαύτως ἀσώματον αὐτὸ ὑπολαμβάνων—*sed subtiles autem corpore, & aereæ, aut igneæ, prout* [z] *scriptum est, Qui facit Angelos suos spiritus, & ministros suos ignem urentem.* And he saith too, that the *Catholick Church knows* this to be so;—ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία γινώσκει, *novit hoc Ecclesia Catholica*, &c. Whether the Fathers of that *Apocryphal Council* approved this Passage then or no, I know not; sure I am the Church of *Rome does not approve it now*, though it was publickly spoke then, and still remains amongst *the Acts of that Council*.

[y] Synodo Nicenâ 2. Act. 4. apud Binium Concil. Tom. 5. pag. 701. C. D. Edit. Paris. Anno 1636.

[z] Hebr. 1. 7.

2. In the same [a] Council (it is in [b] *Baronius* too) there is an Epistle of Pope *Gregory* the Second to the Emperour *Leo Isaurus*, in which there are several things said by that *Pope* (who was sure *as Infallible as any of his Successors*) which are not now *believed at Rome*, though the Epistle was writ by a Pope, and is Recorded amongst the *Acts of that Council*: For 1. *Gregory* there tells the *Emperour* (and us) that our blessed Saviour writ a Letter to *Augarus* (so [c] *Binius* and [d] *Baronius* read *Gregories* Letter, though [e] *Eusebius* have *Agbarus* or *Abgarus*) King of *Edessa*, and withal sent him—τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἔνδοξον αὐτοῦ πρόσωπον, *sacram & gloriosam ejus faciem* (the Picture of it he means) *ad eum misit*. A most putid and *Apocryphal Fable*, and (as such) *damn'd at Rome* almost

[a] Ibid. apud Binium Concil. Tom. 5. pag. 503, 504.

[b] Baronius Annal. Tom. 9. ad Annum 726. num. 30. pag. 68.

[c] Ibid. p. 503. F.

[d] Ubi supra pag. 67. E.

[e] Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. cap. 13. ultimo.

almost [f] twelve hundred years ago by *Pope* [g] *Gelasius* (as Infallible as his Predecessor *Gregory*) in a Council of *seventy Bishops*. 2. *Gregory* tells *Leo*, that they *neither pictured God the Father*, nor was it *possible* for them to do it--- τὸν πατέρα οὐ ζωγραφοῦμεν, &c. *Patrem non pingimus, quoniam quis sit non novimus, Deique natura pingi non potest*. But now the Case is alter'd, they *know* (it seems) *more than Gregory* did, and do that which he said was *impossible*, for they do picture *God* the *Father* (and the *Holy* * *Trinity* too) *a thousand times*. Nay, there is a Note in the margin of *Baronius*, which directly confutes the Text, and tells us so. In the Text *Gregory* saith---*Non pingimus Deum Patrem*. The [h] Note sayes, *POSTEA in Ecclesia usu venit ut pingatur Deus Pater*. He *confesseth the Fact*, they now paint the Father, which anciently was never done; and he adds a reason to (confute Pope *Gregory*, and) prove *it possible to picture God the Father*, as he is described in Scripture---*Quod enim describitur, idem & pingitur, cùm sit eadem ratio utriusque, stili & penicilli*. The Cardinal tells us, *That God the Father may be pictured*; and his reason is --- *The Father may (in words) be described by the pen, therefore he may be pictured with the pencil*. And he does prove this--- *Quia eadem est ratio stili & penicilli*; there is the same *reason of the Pen and Pencil*. But this reason is (like the Conclusion 'tis brought to prove) wildly irrational, inconsistent with truth, and their own *Popish Principles*. For 'tis confess'd by the *Trent* [i] Council, That the *Divinity of God* cannot be *pictured*; and the *Trent* [k] Catechism tells us, (and proves it

[f] Sedet Gelasius Anno Christi 491.

[g] Apud Gratianum Can. Sancta Romana 3. Dist. 15.

* Vid. Breviarium Romanum, Part. Æstiv. in Festo Trinitatis, pag. 132. Antverpiæ, 1660. Nay in *Henry* the sevenths time, the *Picture of the Blessed Trinity* was the sign of a Stationers shop in *Pauls Church-yard*; and I have seen a Book printed with this in the Title page—*Venundantur ad Insigne Trinitatis*, &c. *Londini*, &c.

[h] Baron. loco citato, pag. 68. B.

[i] Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. In princip. de Invocat. Venerat. & Reliquiis sanctorum, *&c.*

[k] Catechis. Romanus, seu Tridentinus, Part. 3. de 1. Præcepto Sect. 18, 19.

it very well) that to *picture* the *Divinity of God*, is a *Violation* of the first *Precept of the Decalogue* (they make the second Precept an Appendix, or part of the first) so that it is (and must be) confess'd, that it ever was, (and still is) utterly unlawfull to picture the *Deity*; and so all use of any *Pencil*, (as to this purpose of *painting* the *Divinity*) is forbidden. — Whence it follows, (by the Cardinals Logique) *Eadem est ratio stili & penicilli*; that as it is unlawfull to paint the *Divinity* with the *pencil*; so it must be unlawful *to express* and *describe* it with the *pen*: But this is evidently untrue, for not only the operations, and persons, and properties of God, but his *Nature* and *Divinity* are (by the *pen*) fully described in *Scripture*, and out of it, by all *Divines* Ancient and Modern, *Protestant* and *Papist*. By which it further appears, that the Cardinals position [*Quod describitur idem & pingitur, quia eadem ratio stili & penicilli*] is *untrue* and Apocryphal; seeing it is, and ever was *lawful* to describe the *Divinity* of *God* by the *pen*; and yet (by the confession of all sides) it neither is, nor ever was lawfull for Jew or Christian, to describe or *picture* the *Divine Nature* with the *pencil*.

3. Once more, (to shew that many things are Recorded in the Acts of *General Councils*, which have no *Synodical Authority*, but are rejected by *Papists* themselves) in the before-mention'd Epistle of *Gregory* the Second to *Leo Isaurus*, amongst the [1] Acts of the second *Nicene* Council; we have the Emperours Accusation of *Pope Gregory* and his Party, for *Worshipping Images* — λέγεις, ὅτι πέτρας, καὶ τοίχους, καὶ σανίδια προσκυνεῖμεν· *Dicis nos Petras, Parietes & Tabellas adorare*: That

[1] Concil. Nicenum 2. apud Binium, Concil. Tom. 3. pag. 504. D. E.

was the Accuſation. The *Anſwer* there is—οὐχ οὕτως λέγεις, &c. *Non eſt ut dicis, ô Imperator*: He denies the Accuſation, *They did not worſhip Walls or Tables* (Images.) The uſe (he ſayes) they made of them, was, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, καὶ εἰς ἔγερσιν, &c. *Ut memoria excitetur, & mens ad cœleſtia erigatur*, (no harm in this) and then adds—ὃ γὰρ ἔχομεν τοῖς ἐλπίσιν εἰς αὐτά, *Spem* † *enim in illis (Imaginibus) non habemus.* This (it ſeems) was true in Pope *Gregories* time (in the beginning of the *Eighth Century*;) but the Caſe is much altered ſince that; the Church of *Rome does worſhip Images*, and acknowledge it; nay, they *worſhip them with Latria* (as they call it) *due to God only*, and *profeſs publickly*, that they PUT THEIR TRUST IN THEM. Let *Aquinas* be a Witneſs for this. He propoſeth the Queſtion. [m] *An Chriſti Crux ſit Latriâ adoranda?* He affirms it, The Croſs (ſaith he) *adoratur eadem adoratione cum Chriſto, ſcilicet adoratione Latriæ*; *& propter hoc etiam Crucem alloquimur ac deprecamur, quaſi ipſum crucifixum*; and that Veneration is to be given, not only to a *Golden Croſs*, but *in aliâ quavis materiâ* (be it made of a *rotten ſtick*, or *Rubies*, all's one for that) *adoranda eſt Latriâ*, &c. And he proves it thus, *Illi exhibemus Latriæ cultum, in quo ponimus ſpem ſalutis: Sed in Cruce Chriſti ponimus ſpem ſalutis*: [*ergo*] The firſt Propoſition is certain: The ſecond he proves by (an *Infallible Authority*) the teſtimony, and *publick practice* of the *Roman Church*; *Quia cantat Eccleſia*, [n] (ſays he) and then he cites that known, old and impious *Hymn*,—

O Crux ave ſpes unica,
Hoc paſſionis tempore.

† Spem in Imaginibus non ponimus, ſayes Pope *Gregory* the ſecond, (he was made Pope *Anno* 714.) and long after him Pope *Innocent* the 3d (made Pope *Anno* 1198.) ſaith the ſame—*imaginibus inclinamus, non ut ſpem ſalutis in illis conſtituamus, ſed ut ad memoriam excitati, devotionem erga Deum demonſtremus.* Vide Opera Innocentii 3. Venet. 1578. Tom. 1. pag. 75. Col. 2.

[m] Aquinas Part. 3. Quæſt. 25. Art. 4.

[n] In Dominica de Paſſione Domini, in Hymno: So 'tis cited in the margin of Aquinas.

Auge

Auge piis Justitiam,
Reisque dona Veniam.

This was the *Hymn* in *Aquinas* his time, since when 'tis (though not *mended*, yet) a little *altered*, for instead of the *two last lines*, in their late Breviaries, they have substituted these,

Piis adauge gratiam,
Reisque dele crimina.

This Hymn is not (I confess) used now by the *Roman* Church, *In Dominica de Passione Domini*, (as 'tis cited in the margin of *Aquinas*;) yet 'tis very many times elsewhere used, as you may see in the late *Roman* [o] *Breviary* at *Antwerp*, *Anno* 1660. So we see *Rome* is not much mended since *Aquinas* his time; they still *worship a despicable wooden Cross with Divine Worship (cultu Latriæ)* they place their *Hope of Salvation* in it; Nay, their *ONLY HOPE*, for so their *Church-Hymn*—*ô Crux ave SPES UNICA*, &c. If it be said, that by *The Cross*, they mean *Christ Crucified*; 'tis evidently untrue: For 1. *Aquinas* sayes, the *Cross* is to be *worshipped* with *Latria*; [p] *propter similitudinem*, and *propter contactum Christi*; because 'tis *like*, and because it *touched* our blessed *Saviours Body*, and that (*ex quavis materia*) of what *Mettle* soever the Cross be, *Gold*, or *Silver*, or *Wood*, (all's one) it may, and *must have Divine Worship*; by all which it is evident he meant (for nothing else possibly can be meant by those words of his) the Material *Cross*, and not our *blessed Saviour*. 2. And that the *Church* of *Rome* in that

[o] 1. *Sabbato ante Dominicam passionis*. pag. 446.
2. *Sabbato infra Hebdomadam Passionis*. p. 461.
3. *Maii* 3. *In festo Inventionis S. Crucis*. pag. 876. Partis Hiemalis dicti Breviarii.
4. *Sept.* 14. *In festo Exaltationis S. Crucis*. pag. 649. Partis Æstvæ istius Breviarii.

[p] Aquinas ubi supra Parte 3. Quæst. 25. Art. 4. And yet the 2. Council of *Nice*, which first established worshipping of Images, expressly denyes *Latria* to be due to any thing save God— εἰς ἕνα μόνον θεὸν τὴν λατρείαν καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἡμῶν ἀπαλλήσαντες. *In unum solum Deum Latriam & fidem nostram ponimus* (says *Tarasius*) And the Council assented— πᾶσα σύνοδος οὕτως φρονεῖ, &c. Binius Tom. 5. pag. 570. D. Edition. Paris. 1636.

moſt *blaſphemous Hymn*, does (and muſt) mean ſo too, and that 'tis not *Chriſt* (our bleſſed Saviour) but the very *wooden Croſs*, which they call *Spes Unica*, is no leſs evident from the immediately preceding words of that Hymn, Thus---

Arbor decora & fulgida,
Electa digno ſtipite,
Tam ſancta membra tangere,
Statera facta Corporis, &c.

After which words (which can relate to nothing but the *wooden Croſs*) it immediately follows---

O Crux ave ſpes Unica, &c.

And that this is indeed their meaning, that the *Material Croſs* (be it Gold, Silver or Wood, or what elſe you will) is the thing which they worſhip with *Latria*; is manifeſtly declared in their *Roman Pontifical*; where deſcribing the Order of the Proceſſion to be uſed at the Reception of the Emperour into any great Town or City when the *Popes Legate* is there; We are told that the *Sword* (*Inſigne Imperiale.*) is born before the *Emperour*, and the *Croſs* (*Inſigne Papale*) before the *Legate*. Then 'tis there ordered, that the *Croſs* ſhall have the (*more honourable*, or) *right hand* in the *Proceſſion*, and the *Imperial Sword* the *left hand*: The reaſon there given is this---[q] *Crux Legati, QUIA DEBETUR EI LATRIA, erit à dextris, & gladius Imperatoris à ſiniſtris.* So then (if the Church of *Rome* underſtood her own meaning, and ſpeak truth in *Her Publick and Authentick Offices*) *Latria* is *due*, and by *them given* to that *Croſs* which is carried in Proceſſion, which certainly is not our *Bleſſed Saviour*, but the *Material*

[q] Vide Pontificale Romanum juſſu Clementis 8. reſtitutum Romæ, 1611. In Rubrica Ordinis ad recipiend. Proceſſionaliter Imperatorem, pag. 480.

rial Croſs, whether of Gold, or Silver, or Wood, &c.

And here (though it be not directly to our preſent buſineſs, and I beg your pardon for the extravagance) I ſhall add a little more, not out of any *private Author*, (of how great Authority and Repute ſoever) but out of *their Publick and moſt Authentick Offices*, that you may ſee how much the Church of *Rome* (ſince the time of *Gregory* the ſecond) is improved in her *Image-worſhip*, eſpecially in her prodigious, and more than *Pagan Superſtition* and *Idolatry* in her *Staurolatria*, and worſhipping the Croſs. In their Roman Pontifical, in their ſolemn *Benediction of a New Croſs* (that's the *Lemma* or *Title* to that Office) they pray---

1. Thus--[r] *Benedic Domine Jeſu Chriſte, HANC CRUCEM TUAM, per quam eripuiſti mundum à poteſtate Dæmonum*, &c. 1. The Goſpel expreſly tells us, and all good Chriſtians know, That it was our bleſſed Saviours *Blood* and *Paſſion* which delivered us, *à poteſtate Dæmonum*, not two deſpicable wooden ſticks laid a-croſs. 2. But if it had been the Croſs, by which he freed us, *à poteſtate Dæmonum*, yet certainly it was that Croſs on which he actually ſuffered (*An. Tiber.* 19.) and not any Croſs which had no being till 1600. years after his Paſſion, and the Redemption of the World; and yet 'tis here, *Benedictio NOVÆ CRUCIS*: A *Carpenter* makes a *Wooden Croſs* to day, to morrow the *Biſhop Conſecrates* and bleſſeth it in this *Solemn* (and *Impious*) *Form*---*Benedic hanc Crucem tuam* (this New Croſs, which was never *his*, any more than *theirs*) *per quam eripuiſti Mundum*, &c.

[r] Pontificale Romanum, p. 350. De *Benedictione Novæ Crucis*, Editionis Romæ, 1611. Where the firſt Rubrick begins thus---- *Nova Crux, ſeu Tabula, in qua Crucifixus eſt depictus, hoc modo benedicitur.* A *New Croſs* of Gold, or Silver, or Wood, the *Picture of it*, or the *Table* in which 'tis pictured (all's one) ſo it is to be bleſs'd.

2. After

2. After this follows another Prayer in the *ſame Office*, and the ſame page of that *Pontifical*, ſo *blaſphemouſly impious*, that 'tis a wonder, the *Contrivers were not*, and the *Uſers* of that Prayer *are not afraid* of a Thunderbolt, or Fire and Brimſtone to conſume them in the practice of ſuch prodigious impiety. The Prayer (*horreſco referens*) is this---- *

Rogamus te, D. Sancte Pater Omnipotens, ut digneris benedicere hoc Signum Crucis tuæ (in the old *ORDO ROMANUS* it is [r] *Hoc LIGNUM CRUCIS tuæ*) *ut ſit REMEDIUM SALUTARE GENERI HUMANO; SIT SOLIDITAS FIDEI, PROFECTUS BONORUM OPERUM, REDEMPTIO ANIMARUM, SIT SOLAMEN, ET PROTECTIO, AC TUTELA CONTRA SÆVA JACULA INIMICORUM*, &c. Is it poſſible for any man in his Wits, (who labours not under that, ἐνέργειαν πλάνης, that *efficacious* and curſed *deluſion*, [t] *to believe a lye*) to believe, that *two deſpicable pieces of Wood knock'd*, and *hew'd*, and cut, and laid a-croſs by a ſimple Carpenter to day, ſhould the ſame, (or next) day be made a *Saving means of Mankind*, the *Redemption of our Souls*, our *Comfort* and *Protection*, and *Defence* againſt the *Devil*? How ſhould two *rotten ſticks defend our Souls*, which cannot any way *defend themſelves*? In the old [u] *Ordo Romanus*, (as is aboveſaid) it is-- *Rogamus, ut digneris benedicere hoc LIGNUM CRUCIS, ut ſit remedium ſalutare generi humano, Redemptio animarum*, &c. whence 'tis evident,

* And that you may ſee the ſtupidity and madneſs of Popiſh Idolatry, in the MS. *Miſſale ſecundum uſum Abbatum Eveſhamenſis Monaſterii* (in my poſſeſſion) there is *Benedictio Sepulchri*, wherein the grave is bleſs'd with theſe very words, *ut ſit Remedium ſalutare humano generi, Redemptio animæ*, &c.

[r] Vid. Ordinem Romanum veterem apud Georgium Ferrarium *de Catholicæ Eccleſiæ Divinis Officiis*, &c. pag. 86. Col. 2. B. Edit. Romæ, 1591. where the prayer is verbatim the ſame, only *Lignum Crucis* there, is here changed into *Signum Crucis*.

[t] 2 Theſſ. 2. 11.

[u] That *Ordo Romanus*, was compoſed by Bernoldus Conſtantienſis Presbyter, circa An. 1060. Poſſevin. in Apparatu, & Trithemius in Bernoldo Conſtantienſi, & Voſſius de Symb. Cœnæ Dom. Theſ. 2. pag. 441.

dent, that (after ſuch Benediction, for, I ſuppoſe, they believed their *Benediction* was *effectual*) they rely'd upon the (*Lignum Crucis*) *Wood* of the *Croſs*, as on their *Saviour*, and the *Redeemer of their ſouls*; and now (having changed thoſe words into *SIGNUM CRUCIS*) they muſt relie on the *Sign of the Croſs* for the *ſalvation of their ſouls*; both which are alike ſtupidly *irrational*, and (beyond all diſpute) highly *Idololatrical*. And leſt you ſhould think that this impious Prayer or Benediction of the *Croſs*, is only in the old *Ordo Romanus*, and *Pontifical*; or that now they have left it out, (as not approving ſuch a ſtupid and impious piece of Impiety) you may find it (in the ſame words and *Benediction*) both in the [x] *Rituale Romanum*, at *Antwerp*, 1652. and the [y] *Rituale Pariſienſe*, printed at *Paris*, 1654. And that you may ſee the ſtrange folly and contradiction of Errour and Superſtition, (for Errours are inconſiſtent both with themſelves and Truth, the Church of *Rome* tells us, That the *Images* of *Saints*, the *Croſs*, and ſuch like things, though they be, *Rerum ſacrarum ſigna*, yet they are no *Sacraments*---- [z] *Quia ſanctitatis & Juſtitiæ vim efficiendæ non habent*; they have no *Power* or *Efficacy* to produce *Grace* or *Sanctity*. So the *Roman Catechiſm*, and ſo the *Trent Council* (both Authentick at *Rome*) [a] *Imagines Chriſti, Deiparæ*, &c. *ſunt venerandæ, non quòd credatur iis ineſſe aliqua Virtus, propter quam ſint colendæ, vel quòd ab iis aliquid ſit petendum, vel quòd fiducia in Imagine ſit figenda*, &c. Now, if the *Roman Catechiſm*, or *Trent-Council* ſay true, (and if they do not, good night to their *pretended Infallibility*) then neither the *Croſs* of *Chriſt*, nor *Images*, *Vim Juſtitiæ*

[x] Rituale Roman. Antverp. 1652. pag. 280, 281.

[y] Rituale Pariſienſe, Pariſ. 1654. pag. 394.

[z] Catechiſ. Romanus, Part. 2. Cap. 7. de Sacramentis in genere. §. 12.

[a] Concilium Tridentinum Seſſ. 25. de Invocat. & Veneratione, & ſacris Imaginibus.

Juſtitiæ efficiendæ ullam habent; nulla Virtus iis meſt propter quam ſunt colendæ; nihil ab iis eſt petendum, nec fiducia in iis figenda. And if this be true, then all the paſſages before cited out of their *Ordo Romanus*, their Authentique *Breviary*, the *Pontifical* and *Ritual* are manifeſtly falſe, (and then too, *good night to their Infallibility*:) For in that Hymn,

O Crux ave ſpes UNICA,
Auge piis Juſtitiam,
Reiſque dona Veniam.

They pray to the Croſs, and yet they ſay, *Nihil ab iis eſt petendum.* 2. Here they ſay, the Croſs is *Spes Unica*, and yet they tell us, *Nulla fiducia in iis eſt figenda.* 3. Here their *Church* ſayes, the *Croſs---Auget piis Juſtitiam, reiſque donat veniam*; that it is---*Remedium ſalutare generi humano, ſoliditas fidei, redemptio animarum*, &c. (for ſo their *Ritual* and *Pontifical* have it in the places cited) and yet they tell us too (as above) that neither in the *Croſs*, or any *Image---Vis ulla ineſt ſanctitatis aut juſtitiæ efficiendæ*, aut *Virtus ulla propter quam ſint colendæ.* If this be true, (that there is *no Power* or *Virtue* in the *Croſs* to *hear* or *help* us) then their worſhip of it with *Latria* (worſhip due to *God himſelf*, as [b] they confeſs) is evident and *impious Idolatry*: for what can be more ſtupidly *Idololatrical*, than to give *Divine Worſhip*, (due only to an *Infinite Power* and *Excellency*) to a *wooden* (and ſometimes a *rotten*) *Croſs*, *In qua* (by their own Confeſſion) *vis nulla ineſt ſanctitatis efficiendæ, nec* VIRTUS ULLA *propter quam eſt colenda.* In ſhort, were I not certainly aſſured by the *ſacred Scripture*, that all *ſin is folly*, and *Idolatry* Spiritual [c] *Madneſs*: I could ſcarce believe that men in their wits ſhould profeſs and publiſh ſuch ἀσυ-

[b] Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 13. de Euchariſtia. Cap. 5. *Latriæ cultus qui vero Deo debetur.*

[c] Jerem. 50. 38. *they are mad upon their Idols.*

γεῖα,

ἐκτὰ, such inconsistent Positions, and (as my Countryman *Scotus* calls them) *Incompossibilities. Sed è diverticulo in viam.*

But let it be granted, that *Cyril* did not only (*de facto*) invocate Saint *John*, but *de Judicio* too, that he seriously judged it lawfull and profitable so to do; that he did not only *practise* (as *David* committed *Adultery*, and *Peter* deny'd his *Master*, as to *matter of fact*) but in his *Judgement*, approve *Invocation of Saints*: I say, if all this were freely granted (which is not proved) would it not be a good Argument for the *Romish Doctrine* which *justifies* against ours (which *condemns*) *Invocation of Saints*? *Dub.*

No, it will be no *Argument* at all; For we grant, that not only about the time when Saint *Cyril* made that *Sermon*, (which was *Anno Christi* 451.) but about *eighty years before*, that is, about the year *three hundred and seventy*, *Invocation of Saints* begun to be held *by some*, and *practised* (quite contrary to the *Doctrine* and the *practice* of the *Ancient Church*) especially by *some Monks*, by some *Orators*, *Preachers*, and *Christian Poets*, as you may see both confess'd and proved in *Two Learned Men*, [d] (*Martinus Chemnitius*, and [e] *Joh. Ger. Vossius*;) in whom you may find a *just account*, *when*, and *how*, and *by what steps* and degrees *Invocation of Saints came into the Church*. They acknowledge, that about the end of the fourth Century, *Basil*, *Nyssen*, and *Nazianzene* have *several passages*, which are not only *Rhetorical Apostrophe's*, or *Prosopopœia's*, but such as are indeed *Invocations*, and not to be *excused*. Nor does this any way *prejudice our Cause*, who willingly *acknowledge* and *confess* such instances, *to-* *Answ.*

[d] Chemnitii Examen Concil. Trident. part. 2. pag. 200. Col. 1. Edit. Francofurti, 1578.

[e] Vid Vossii Theses de Invocat. Sanctorum Disp. Historica altera. These 1. &c. pag. 189. Edit. Oxon. 1628.

ward the end of the fourth Century, well knowing they *come too late* to prove *Invocation of Saints a Catholick Doctrine*. For *Vincentius Lirinenſis* his *Rule* is, (and that much magnified every where by the *Popiſh Doctors*) that, *That is Catholick* only---- [f] *Quod ubique, quod* [g] *ſemper, quod ab omnibus creditum eſt*; and therefore, if the *Primitive Church* for above *three whole Centuries*, neither *approved* nor *practis'd* any *invocation of Saints*; if all their *Addreſſes* and *Prayers* were made to *God only*, and by the *Mediation* and *Interceſſion of Jeſus Chriſt* (and not of any *Saint* or *Angel*) *ſolely deſired*; then (by *Lirinenſis* his Rule) whatever is *poſtnate* to this, and has its *Birth* and *Original* in the fourth Century; this (whatever it be) will be ſo far from being a *Catholick Verity*, that it will be an up-ſtart *Novelty*, as indeed it is, *& ſic tranſeat cum cæteris erroribus*. 2. When *Nazianzene* (and ſome others about that time) begun to uſe (in their *Panegyriques*, Poems and Homilies) ſome *more than Rhetorical Invocations*, they did it with ſuch *Qualifications*, and limiting clauſes annex'd, which plainly ſhew that they were *dubious*, and had *no aſſurance* to be heard. So *Nazianzene* making his Addreſs to the Soul of *Conſtantine* (or *Conſtantius*, as it is in ſome Copies) ſayes thus--- [h] *Quin hæc quoque audiat Conſtantini Magni Anima* (εἰ τις αἴσθησις) *ſi quis mortuis ſenſus ſit.* His Invocation is *Hypothetical*, on *ſuppoſition* that he could *hear his Prayers*; which whether he could or no, *he knew not*. Nor was it poſſible he ſhould, (without Divine *Revelation*) there being no *Principle in Nature* or *Scripture* from whence it can *certainly be deduced*, that *Souls departed* can *either hear* or *help* us here below.

[f] Vincentius Lirinenſis adverſus Hæreſes, Cap. 3.

[g] *Semper*, that is, it muſt be (elſe it cannot be Catholick) *veritas à Chriſto & Apoſtolis tradita, & ab Eccleſia ſucceſſive credita.* So that whatever commenceth *after Chriſt and his Apoſtles*, is a *Novelty*, no *Catholick Verity*.

[h] Nazianzene Orat. 1. contra Julianum in principio. Other ſuch examples you have in *Voſſius* his Theſes de Invocat. Sanctorum, pag. 199, 200. Edit. ſupradictæ.

low. He (whoever he be) who thinks otherwiſe, let him *produce* ſuch a *principle* and *deduction*, and I do *hereby promiſe* to be his *Proſelyte*. 3. Beſides this (according to the Popiſh Principles) Invocation of Saints preſuppoſeth the Saints *to enjoy the* [i] *beatifical Viſion*; for on that they do ground *the knowledge the Saints have* of things here below. It is *in ſpeculo Trinitatis*, that they *ſee our wants and deſires*; *Qui videt videntem omnia, is videt omnia*, (that's the Schoolmens Axiome) and then it will follow, that they *who deny the departed Saints* to enjoy the *beatifical Viſion*, muſt alſo (unleſs they will contradict themſelves) deny their *Invocation*, this neceſſarily preſuppoſing that. But now it was a *common Opinion* amongſt the Ancients for above *four hundred* years, (*infra ætatem Auguſtini*, ſayes [k] Scaliger truly) *That Souls departed did not enjoy the beatifical Viſion till the day of Judgement*, but were *Extra Cœlum in abditis quibuſdam receptaculis*, where (in *Tertullians* language) they did--- *In candidâ expectare diem judicii*. Sure I am, [l] *Irenæus* was of that Opinion, and ſo were *Juſtin Martyr*, *Origen*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, *Euthymius*, *Aretas*, *Victor*, *Lactantius*, *Hilarius*, *Prudentius*, *Ambroſius*, *Auguſtinus*, *Bernardus*, ---- (*nec aliter omnes*, if you will believe *Scaliger*) and very many more, as might eaſily be demonſtrated, were it now pertinent. So that none of thoſe were of this Opinion, unleſs they contradicted their own Principles, and if they did, we have little reaſon to believe them. 4. If it be ſaid, that *Baſil*, *Nazianzene*, *Nyſſen*, (and others in the latter end of the fourth and following Centuries) were Excellent Perſons, Learned and Pious Fathers of

[i] Lombardus Sent. lib. 4. Diſt. 45. Durandus ibidem Quæſt. 4. §. 8. &c. & Scholaſtici (quos ſcio) omnes.

[k] *Joſeph Scaliger* Annot. in Joh. 18. verſ. 31. where he ſaith, *OMNES VETERES etiam infra ætatem Auguſtini*, &c.

[l] Vid. Sixt. Senenſem Bibl. Sanctæ lib. 6. Annot. 345. where he confeſſes this, and cites the places of *thoſe Fathers* (and almoſt as *many more*) who were all of this opinion.

the Church, and therefore we may ſecurely imbrace their Doctrine, and follow their example in the Invocation of Saints: To this we ſay,

1. We both may and will follow them, ſo far as they follow *Chriſt*, S. *Paul* requires no more: [m] *Be you followers of me, even as I alſo am of Chriſt.* Whatever *Doctrines* pretend to be *Catholick* and *Evangelical*, and cannot derive their Pedegree from our *bleſſed Saviour*, and *his Apoſtles* (let their *Antiquity be what* it will, if ſhort of this) (all men ſhould, and) *we do reject. Chriſtus ſolus audiri debet*, (ſaies [n] *Cyprian*) *Hic eſt filius meus dilectus, IPSUM AUDITE*, and then he adds,— *Quare ſi SOLUS Chriſtus audiendus eſt, non debemus attendere, quid ALIUS ANTE NOS faciendum putaverit, ſed quid, qui ante omnes eſt, CHRISTUS, prior fecerit. Neq; enim HOMINIS conſuetudinem ſequi oportet, ſed DEI veritatem*, &c. As *Cyprian* neither did, nor would follow *any before him*, further than they *followed Chriſt* and *his Apoſtles*: ſo neither ſhould we follow any before us. And therefore, if an *hundred Fathers* in the end of the *fourth Century*, ſhould *preach up*, and *practiſe Invocation of Saints* (without *warrant from Scripture*, or the *doctrine* and *conſtantly received practice* of the *primitive Chriſtians* down from the Apoſtles) this would be *no argument* to us, nor ſhould to any. Sure I am, *Communicating* [o] *Infants at their Baptiſm*, and *abſtaining from all* [p] *Blood* (*as utterly unlawful*) were more *antient*, and far more *generally believed and practis'd* in the Primitive Church (Eaſt and Weſt, *Greek* and *Latine*) and yet the *Church of Rome*

[m] 1 Cor. 11. 1.

[n] Cyprian. Epiſt. 63. ad Cæcilium, apud Pamelium pag. 249. Col. 2. A.

[o] So Clemens Roman. Conſtit. Apoſt. l. 8. cap. Cyprian. Epiſt. 59. ad Fidum. Gennad. de Dogmat. cap. 52. Concil. Toletan. 2. Can. 11. Auguſt. Epiſt. 93. Paulinus, Epiſc. Nolanus, Epiſt. 12. ad Severum. Fulgentius ad Ferrandum Diaconum, Cap. 11. *Græci* uſque hodie *communicant Infantes.* Azorius Inſtit. Moralium, lib. 5. cap. 11. Duravit etiam hæc Conſuetudo *communicandi Infantes in Eccleſ. occidentali* uſque Tempora *Ludovici Pii* & *Lotharii.* Ita Beat. Rhenanus in Tertullianum de Corona Militis, pag. 38. Edit. Junii.

[p] *No Church Latine or Greek* allowed eating *any blood*, for 1215. years after Chriſt; that is, *till Tranſubſtantiation was decreed.* The Greek Church allows it not to this day.

has

has (notwithſtanding *their antiquity*, and that great *authority* which received them) rejected both: and therefore ſhe muſt pardon us, if we reject *Invocation of Saints*, which begun later, and *had far leſs authority and conſent of Fathers* to eſtabliſh it.

In ſhort, he who *impartially conſiders* the *doctrine* and *practice* of the *Church of England* and that *of Rome*, (as to the buſineſs of Invocation) I ſay, ſuch a one, who has eyes and will impartially uſe them, may evidently ſee, that *our way is ſure*, and theirs wholly *uncertain* (to ſay no worſe) and *irrational*. We direct our Prayers neither to *Saint nor Angel*, but to *God only*, and in the name and *mediation of Jeſus Chriſt only*. And for this, we have

1. Divine *Precept*, and a *command to come* to him.
2. A *promiſe* that he will hear and help if we do come. *Pſal.* 50. 15. *Call upon me in the day of trouble, and I will deliver thee*, &c. and Matth. 11. 28. *Come unto me all you that labour, and I will give you reſt.* And John 16. 23. *Whatſoever ye ſhall ask the Father in my name* (*not in the name* of any Saint or Angel) *he will give it you.* So John 14. 13, 14. And Phil. 4. 6. *In every thing, by Prayer, let your Requeſts be made known to God*, &c.
3. The practice of all *good men* (ſo far as we have any Record) from the foundation of the World till above 300. Years after Chriſt. For all the Prayers of the *Patriarchs*, *Prophets*, *and holy men* mentioned in the *Old Teſtament*, of our bleſſed *Saviour and Apoſtles* in the New, and of the *primitive and pious Chriſtians* afterwards (for the time before limited) are ſolely directed *to God*, and never to *any Saint or Angel*. So that, we having ſo many great and good *Examples* to follow;

follow; ſo divine a *command to come*, and ſo gracious a *promiſe* to be heard *when we do come*; Here is the *ground* and *foundation* of our *faith* and *confidence* of ſucceſs, *when we pray to God*, in the *name of Jeſus Chriſt*: being alſo *fully aſſured* (by the *clear principles* of nature, as well as Scripture) 1. That the God to whom we pray, is *omniſcient*, and ſo *able to hear all our Prayers*. 2. That he is *Allſufficient*, and therefore *able to ſupply all our neceſſities*. 3. That his *mercies* in *Jeſus Chriſt are infinite*, and therefore he is *willing* (which alſo evidently appears by his many and moſt *gracious promiſes*) both to hear and help us: Theſe are the juſt and *ſatisfying grounds* of our *praying to God only*, and of all our *comfort* and *aſſurance* of *ſucceſs* in ſo doing.

But on the other ſide, the *Church of Rome* praying to (I know not what) *Saints and Angels*, and having no juſt ground or warrant for it, do that, which is not only *irrational* and *vain*, but (what, I fear, they will one day find) *ſinful and impious*. For,

1. There is *no Precept* for Worſhipping and *Invocation of Saints*: nor is it pretended to. All the *Trent*-Fathers durſt ſay (and that's not true neither) is [q] *Bonum & utile eſt, ſuppliciter Sanctos invocare. Bonum, ſed non ex lege neceſſarium*: there is no pretence of *any law* to enjoin it. And then 1. Our refuſing to pray to Saints, is *no fault in us*; ſeeing no law requires it. 2. Their praying to them, their *worſhipping Saints and Angels*, will be (at beſt) ἐθελοθρησκεία, a piece of *Will-worſhip*, damn'd by the Apoſtle, *Col.* 2. 19. And (notwithſtanding all [r] their σοφὰ φάρμακα, their wild expoſitions and ſhifts

[q] Concil. Tridentinum Seſſ. 25. de Invocat. Sanctorum. vid. *Catechiſmum Roman.* part. 3. cap. 2. §. 11, 12, 13, &c. where the *Doctrine of Invocation* is *ex profeſſo* explain'd, and (as well as they can) *proved by Councils* and *Fathers*, (partly in the Text, and partly in the Margent;) but not one word *of Scripture* to prove either *precept* or *promiſe* for *Invocation of Saints*. See the laſt and beſt Edition of that *Catechiſm*, Pariſ. 1635.

[r] Vid. Gul. Eſtium in Col. 2. 19.

ſhifts to avoid that cenſure) they *really are guilty* of that crime, and *liable to that damnation.*

2. There is *no promiſe*, that our Prayers *ſhall be heard*, or any *way beneficial* to us, in caſe *we do pray to Saints.* If any think otherwiſe, let him ſhew that promiſe; and (for my part) *Cedat Iülus agris*, let him take the Cauſe.

3. There is no *Example*, or any *Record* of any *Patriarch*, *Prophet*, or *pious perſon*, who directed *their Prayers* to any *Saint*, from the *foundation of the World* till our *Saviours birth*, nor of any *Apoſtle* or *good Chriſtian* for 300. *years after it.* And here, 1. For the time before our Saviours Birth, I confeſs [f] *Bellarmine* brings *ſome places* (moſt *impertinently*) out of the *Old Teſtament*, to prove *Invocation of Saints.*

[f] Bellarmin. De Beatit. Sanctorum, Lib. 1. Cap. 29.

But he confutes, and evidently *contradicts himſelf* in the ſame [t] Chapter; and expreſly ſays, That *the Saints* in the time of the Old Teſtament did not injoy the *beatifical Viſion* till our *Saviours Reſurrection*, and ſo *could not hear the Prayers*, or *know the wants* of the living, (and ſo it had been vain to pray to thoſe who could not hear.) His words are theſe. [u] *Sancti qui ante Chriſti adventum moriebantur, non intrabant in cœlum, nec Deum videbant, NEC COGNOSCERE POTERANT ordinariè preces ſupplicantium*; &c. So (by their own Confeſſion) there was no Invocation of Saints before our Saviours Reſurrection; or if there was any, it was *vain* and *unprofitable*, becauſe (for all that Period of time) the dead were in *ſuch a condition* (*extra cœlum*) that they *could not hear the Prayers of the Living.* I know that the *Trent*-Fathers ſay, *Invocation of Saints*, is, [x] *Juxta uſum Catholicæ & Apoſtolicæ Eccleſiæ, primævis Chriſtianæ Religionis temporibus receptum.* And the *Trent Catechiſm* tells

[t] Bellarmin. Ibid. Cap. 19. §. *Item Exod.* 32.

[u] And 'tis the Opinion of *Pet. Lombard*, Sentent. lib. 4. Durand. Ibid. Quæſt. 4. Ad tertium, and their Schoolmen generally.

[x] Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 25. de Invocat. Sanctorum, in Principio.

tells us, that the *Chief Argument* they have to eſtabliſh *Invocation of Saints*, is, *Cuſtome continued ſince the Apoſtles time.* The words theſe: [y] *Et, quod* CAPUT EST, *conſuetudo accedat ab Apoſtolis accepta, & in Eccleſiâ perpetuò retenta*, &c. This they ſay: *Invocatio ſanctorum eſt conſuetudo ab Apoſtolis accepta*, &c. But when they come to prove this, they have not *one Author* to witneſs for them in the firſt *three hundred years*, (the time of which we ſpeak.) The Compilers of the *Roman* [z] *Catechiſm*, and [z] *Bellarmine*, and [a] *Lindanus Ruræmundenſis Epiſcopus* (and ſo others) *data opera*, and diligently rake up all the *Teſtimonies* they can out of *Councils* and *Fathers*, and yet bring not *one Father* (there is no *pretence* for *Councils*) who writ within the *three hundred* years next after our Bleſſed Saviour, ſave *Dionyſius Areopagita*, and *Irenæus*. Now for *Areopagita* he is a ſpurious *Author*, (of no *Authority*, as to the particular we now ſpeak of) as is evidently demonſtrated by [b] *our Authors*, and confeſs'd by *Cajetan*, *Eraſmus*, *Valla*, *Gul. Grocinus*, and others. 2. For *Irenæus*, him (I confeſs) to be *Teſtis Idoneus*, within the time mentioned, for he flouriſhed about the year of our Lord 170. But for the *place* in *Irenæus* which they cite to prove *Invocation of Saints*, it is ſo *ridiculouſly impertinent*, that I wonder any *knowing perſon* ſhould produce it; and yet the wonder is the leſs, when I conſider, that as a drowning man will lay *hold on any twigg*, *how inſignificant ſoever to ſave or help him*: So (being *reſolved to maintain* a deſperate and *dying Cauſe*) they muſt uſe bad *Mediums* who have no better. The place in *Irenæus* is this, [c] *Sicut Eva ſeducta eſt, ut effugeret Deum, ſic*

[y] Catechiſ. Roman. ubi ſupra, part. 3. cap 2. §. 12.

[z] Locis ſupra citatis.

[a] Lindanus in Panoplia, lib. 3. cap 26. He cites (I confeſs) there, *Origenes in Jobum*, a ſpurious work, not *by Origen*, but *an Arian*.

[b] Vid. Cocum in Cenſura Patrum in D. Areopagita. Rivetus in Critica ſacra, lib. 7. cap. 9. 10.

[c] Irenæus adverſus Hæreſes l. 5. cap. 19. pag. 464. Edit. Feu-Ardentii. Et cap. 16. pag. 341. Edit. Gallaſii. Et in Editione Irenæi per Eraſmum, pag. 238.

ſic Maria ſuaſa eſt obedire Deo, ut Virginis Evæ Virgo Maria fieret advocata. This is the place in *Irenæus* ſo much (and ſo impertinently) magnified. Here I obſerve, ---

1. That *Feu-Ardentius* (that all might take notice of it) puts this *Note* in the *Margin* over againſt it----- *Beata Virgo Maria, Evæ & aliorum peccantium advocata eſt.* But (that I may, and juſtly enough, uſe that old ſaying) *Maledicta ſit Gloſſa quæ corrumpit Textum.* Had he ſaid only----*Maria Evæ advocata eſt*, the Text of *Irenæus* would have been ſome ground for it: But when he puts in----*Et aliorum peccantium Advocata*, (of which nothing in *Irenæus*) this muſt be reckon'd amongſt the *piæ fraudes* of *Rome*, by which they uſually and *impiouſly couzen* inconſiderate perſons *into their Superſtitions.*

2. In his *Notes* on the place, he begins thus---- [d] *Hinc EVIDENTISSIMUM eſt priſcos Patres & Martyres, proximè ab ipſis Apoſtolorum temporibus, Deiparam Virginem invocaſſe, cæteriſque, ut implorarent, Authores fuiſſe.* Sure I am, there is *nothing in Irenæus* (notwithſtanding his---*Hinc evidentiſſimum eſt*) to prove *any one thing in this confident Aſſertion*; and yet I ſhall not call him *impudent*, but this I may modeſtly and truly ſay, That certainly *a little thing will not make him bluſh.*

[d] Feu-Ardentius in Irenæum. Ibid. pag. 464. num. 3.

3. As *Feu-Ardentius* has a long *Note* and *Diſcourſe*, to prove how much that Paſſage makes for *Popery*, and *Invocation of Saints*: So [e] *Gallaſius* has as long (indeed thrice as long) a Diſcourſe to clear the Text, and *Irenæus* from the ſuſpicion of it; or (in caſe he meant what *Rome* would have) to confute him. Now

[e] Gallaſius in cap. 16. lib. 5. Irenæi §. 3. pag. 399.

(that I may freely ſay, *what I believe is true* in this particular) they are both beſide the Book; nor has *Feu-Ardentius* any *juſt ground to brag and magnifie*, nor *Gallaſius to be afraid* of this Paſſage in *Irenæus*. For indeed it makes nothing *for them*, nor *againſt us*. That this may appear; I ſay----

1. Admit (which is not true) that *Irenæus* in this Paſſage did really *approve Invocation of Saints*, and affirm that the Virgin *Mary* was their *Advocate*; He affirms too, *That our Saviour lived till he was* [f] *about fifty years old*, (and yet 'tis certain, and *on all ſides confeſs'd*, that he was Crucifi'd *Anno Ætatis* 34 *currente*.) He affirms alſo the *Millenary* [g] *Opinion* to be *True*, *That the Saints ſhall Reign One Thouſand years in temporal felicity before the day of Judgement*, (and yet this goes for *Hereſie* at *Rome*, and has done ſo this *thirteen hundred* years at leaſt.) Now as it will not follow, *Irenæus affirms our Saviour to have liv'd about fifty years*; and *that the Millenary Opinion is true*; [ergo] *Thoſe Affirmations of his are truth*, and we to believe them; (for both *Proteſtant and Papiſt disbelieve both, notwithſtanding Irenæus* his *Authority*) So neither will it follow, *Irenæus approves Invocation of Saints* (*dato hoc, ſed non conceſſo*) [ergo] *We are to approve it too*. Seeing there neither is, nor can be any reaſon why his *Authority* ſhould *neceſſarily conclude this*, and not the *two former Poſitions*, he *equally aſſerting all*.

[f] Irenæus, lib. 2. Cap. 39, 40.

[g] Irenæus, lib. 5. cap. 32, &c. confeſs'd by Feu-Ardentius, and largely explain'd, pag. 494. & ſequentibus, uſque ad finem libri.

2. But further, *'tis certain*, *Irenæus* neither did, nor (without *evident contradiction* of his *own Principles*, and *theirs of ROME* too) could believe, that *Eve* (or any body

body elſe) did *invocate the Virgin Mary*, or any *deceaſed Saint* whomſoever. For 'tis his expreſs Opinion, *That the Souls of all dead Saints* (of the *Apoſtles*, *Martyrs*, and the *Virgin Mary* too) are in an *inviſible place*, and ſhall not be *admitted to the Viſion of God* till after the *Reſurrection*----- [h] *Diſcipulorum Animæ* (ſaith *Irenæus*) *abibunt in inviſibilem locum* (He writ in Greek, and ἀΐδης was his word, which properly, is τόπος ἀϊδὴς, *locus inviſibilis*; or, as *Tertullian* and *Auguſtine* call thoſe places, *Abdita animarum receptacula*,) *& ibi uſque ad reſurrectionem commorabuntur, ſuſtinentes reſurrectionem; poſt recipientes corpora, ſic* VENIENT IN CONSPECTUM DEI, &c. This was evidently *Irenæus* his *Opinion*, (and Saint *Auguſtines* too, as [i] *Feu-Ardentius* there confeſſes, and proves out of many places of that Father,) *That the Saints departed did not enjoy the Preſence of God*, and the *beatifical Viſion*; and ſeeing it is confeſs'd by *Bellarmine* (in the place before [k] cited) and the Church of *Rome*, that *without ſuch Viſion of God*, the Saints departed cannot hear our *Prayers*, or know our *particular deſires* or *wants*; it follows, that if *Irenæus* held *Invocation of Saints*, he muſt hold *Invocation* of thoſe who could not hear, which contradicts the clear *Principles* of *Reaſon*, and the declared ſenſe of the Church of *Rome* too, &c.----

[h] Irenæus, lib. 5. cap. 31. pag. 491. in Edit. Feu-Ardentii. & pag. 250. Edit. Eraſmi.

[i] Feu-Ardentius in Irenæum, pag. 493. Col. 2.

[k] Bellarmin. de Beatitudine Sanct. l. 1. cap. 19. §. Item Exodi. 32.

3. But let *Irenæus* his words be taken in what ſenſe they will, yet 'tis manifeſt, they afford nothing like an Argument, to prove *invocation of Saints*. For 1. *Irenæus* ſayes indeed, *Quod Maria ſuaſa eſt obedire Deo, ut*

fieret Evæ advocata : Whence they may (with ſome ſeeming conſequence) *conclude*, That *Mary* was *Eve's Advocate*, and *pleaded* or *prayed* for her : But this does not prove any *invocation of Saints*. *They* may be our *Advocates*, and (in the general) *pray for us*, (as all confeſs) and yet, *we not pray to them*. Had *Irenæus* ſaid, that the *Virgin Mary* pray'd for *Eve*, that had looked like *Invocation*, but he ſayes no ſuch thing : And indeed *'tis moſt irrational* and *ridiculous* to ſay, That *Eve* prayed to *Mary*, or that *Mary* prayed for her. 1. *Eve* could not pray to the Virgin *Mary*, ſeeing ſhe was *dead* above [1] *three thouſand* years before *Mary* was born. 2. Or thus---- If *Eve* did invocate *Mary*, then, *either while ſhe lived here* in this world, and that was *impoſſible*, becauſe *Mary* was ſo far from being a *Saint* while *Eve* lived, that ſhe had no *being till three thouſand years after* ; or, *after ſhe was dead*, and to ſay that, is *impertinent* ; for the *invocation* we ſpeak of, is that of the *Living*, who pray to *Saints departed*, and not of one departed Saint to another. 3. And further, (notwithſtanding what *Irenæus* ſeems to ſay, and what they of *Rome* would make of it) it was *impoſſible* that the Virgin *Mary* ſhould be *ADVOCATA EVÆ*, even according to the received Principles of the *CHURCH* of *ROME*. For, 1. *Eve* was *confeſſedly dead ſome thouſands* of Years before the Virgin *Mary was a Saint* ; and ſo if the Virgin *prayed* for *Eve*, it muſt be *after ſhe was dead* ; but *no Papiſt ever* ſaid, (nor with any ſenſe can ſay) that the *Saints departed* are *Advocates* for *Saints departed* this life as well as *themſelves* ; but for *the living* left

[1] Natus eſt Chriſtus (ſecundum Jac. Uſſerii Armachani computum) Anno Mundi, 4004. Vid. ejus Annal. Parte poſteriori. pag. 545.

left behind. That which they ſay (and in vain labor to prove) is, *Quòd Sancti defuncti & cœlo donati ſunt vivorum Advocati.* 2. *Eve* was a glorify'd Saint *before the Virgin Mary*, ſo that (upon their Principles) *Eve* might have been *Mariæ advocata*, ſhe being *in Heaven*, and injoying *the beatifical Viſion*, while *Mary* was alive here below. That this is ſo, I prove from the *received Popiſh principles*, thus. 1. *They ſay*, [m] that the Fathers and *Saints of the Old Teſtament*, were not *in Heaven*, but *in Limbo Patrum*, till our Saviours Reſurrection. 2. That our Saviour *at his Reſurrection* (or *immediately after it*) freed them from thence, and brought them to Heaven and the *Beatifick Viſion*, and (ſo amongſt the reſt) Our Grandmother *Eve* muſt be a *glorified Saint in Heaven*, about the time of our bleſſed Saviours *Reſurrection*; whereas it is confeſs'd, that the *Virgin Mary* [n] lived 13, or 14. Years after; ſo that *Eve* (being *in Heaven*, *a glorified Saint*, for 13, or 14. Years, before the *Virgin Mary* came thither,) might be *Advocate* for the *Virgin Mary*, but it was *impoſſible* (what *Irenæus* ſeems to ſay) that *Mary* ſhould be *Evæ advocata*: for ſhe could not be *Eve's Advocate* till ſhe came to Heaven; and *when ſhe came*, it *was too late*; *Eve* did not need her *Advocation*, ſeeing ſhe was *glorify'd before*, and ſo *Senior to the Virgin* 13, or 14. Years, or (for they agree not about the Year of her Death) at leaſt for ſome *number of Years*. The Iſſue is; *Eve* neither did, nor poſſibly could *Invocate the Virgin Mary* (who had no being for above 3000 Years after *Eve* was dead:) nor was it poſſible that the Virgin *Mary* (in *her own perſon*) ſhould be *Eve's Advocate*, ſeeing ſhe was in Heaven before

[m] Aquinas Parte 3. Quæſt. 52. Art. 5. Durandus in 4. Sent. Diſtinct. 45. Quæſt. 4.

[n] Vid. Baronium Annal. Tom. 1. ad Annum 48. n. 4.

before her. I ſay, in her *own perſon*, the words being properly taken: But if the words of *Irenæus* be taken *figuratively*, by an uſual *Metonymia*, (or *Hypallage*, as the Rhetoricians call it) and the Virgin *Mary* be ſaid to *do that*, becauſe ſhe was the *happy mother* of a Son *who did it*; Then the ſenſe of the words will be plain, *Maria eſt Evæ Advocata*, not *by her ſelf perſonally*, but *by her Son*; who is indeed a *Mediator*, *Interceſſor*, and *Advocate* for *Eve*, and all, who are ſaved, from the foundation of the World. The words taken this way, are *good ſenſe*, (but neither *prejudicial to us*, nor *beneficial to Rome*) otherwiſe they are *manifeſtly falſe*.

1. From the premiſes, I argue thus. They who have no [1] *Precept* to *pray to Saints*; nor *any* [2] *Promiſe* that they ſhall be *heard*, or have *any benefit by it*, in *caſe they do pray*; nor any [3] *Practice of the* ° Primitive Church, (for above 300. Years after Chriſt,) to encourage them; nor any *cogent* [4] *reaſon* to *aſſure* and *ſatisfy* their *underſtandings*, that the Saints *do hear*, and *can help them*; theſe *cannot pray in faith without doubting*; ſeeing they have no *medium ſtrong enough* to *exclude doubting*, and create a *certainty* in their *aſſent*. But the Papiſts have no ſuch [1] *Precept*, or [2] *Promiſe*, or [3] *Practice*, or [4] *Reaſon* (from the *light of Nature*, or *Scripture*) to *aſſure them*, that ſuch Prayers will be *profitable* to them; [*ergo*] They cannot pray *in faith without doubting*. He (who ever he be) that can *rationally* make it

° 'Tis confeſs'd, That towards the *end of the* 4th *Century*, ſome particular perſons did *invocate Saints*, (yet *doubtingly*, and therefore *vainly*) but it was long after, before *any Church* in the world uſed it *in their Liturgies*; in *all* which, *all their prayers* are directed *ſolely to God*; in the Liturgies of *James*, *Mark*, *Peter*, *Baſil*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Gregory* the great, *&c.* (all extant in Gr. and Lat.) in the *Miſſa Latina Antiqua* circa Annum 700. uſitata, *&c.* In *all theſe* they prav *for the Saints* departed, (even the *Virgin Mary*) but no prayer directed to any of them. And ſo *in the Canon* of the *Maſs* (the only ancient piece of their *Miſſal*) they *pray for all the Saints* departed; but in the *whole Canon* there is not *one Prayer* to *any Saint or Angel*.

it *appear* to me, that they have *any one* of the *four things*, mention'd in the *minor Propoſition*; I ſhall be thankful to God and him for the diſcovery, *renounce* my *opinion*, (which now I *really believe*) and *imbrace* the *Popiſh Invocation* of Saints, which (as a *novel*, *groundleſs* and *impious error*) I now abhor.

2. Whence I argue further, thus--- All *Prayers not made in faith*, *without doubting*, are *vain*, and (as to the obtaining any thing) *ineffectual*, Jam. 1. 6, 7. But ſuch are the *Popiſh Invocations* of Saints (as wanting *all* thoſe *juſt grounds of aſſurance and certainty*) [ergo] they are *vain* and *ineffectual*.

Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ταῦτα.

FINIS.